



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, DC 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/987,889	12/10/97	BECKER	151-961-10

LM02/1006  
LERNER AND GREENBERG  
P O BOX 2480  
HOLLYWOOD FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER
CHANG, V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2743	5

DATE MAILED: 10/06/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
08/987,889

Applicant(s)  
Becker

Examiner  
Vivian Chang

Group Art Unit  
2743



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2743

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The drawings are objected to because the blocks in fig. 1 are not labelled with proper legends. Correction is required.
2. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chapman (US 5,073,943).

Consider claim 1. Chapman teaches a sound system for a motor vehicle comprising: a control unit; an input unit; a display unit; a unit for generating source data in the form of audio data; an amplifier unit; at least one speaker; a bus system; at least a given one of the units other than the control unit having an associated memory representing a functional scope of the at least one given unit, the functional scope to be transmitted through the bus system to the control unit,

Art Unit: 2743

and the transmitted functional scope to be used in the control unit at least partially for forming a functional scope of the entire system; see fig. 2.

Consider claims 2-6, 9-10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20. Chapman teaches the claimed limitations.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 7-8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19 and 21-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman.

Consider claim 7. Chapman does not teach that the input unit and the display unit are combined into a single unit. However, it would have been obvious that the input unit and the display unit could have been combined into a single unit since such practice have been well known in the art for the purpose of saving space and so on.

Consider claims 8, 13, 17 and 21-26. The device of Chapman as modified would have met the claimed limitations.

Consider claim 11. It would have been obvious that DVD players could have been included in the system since DVD players are just one type of well known multimedia device.

Art Unit: 2743

Consider claim 15. It would have been obvious that the predetermined period of time for forming the functional scope of the system could have been adjustable since it would have been determined based on designer's needs.

Consider claim 19. It would have been obvious that the system of Chapman could have been in a mobile home since Chapman does not limit the system to only one type of vehicle only.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hadley et al (US 5,243,640); Nagashima (US 5,218,643).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**


(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2743

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivian Chang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6739.

  
**VIVIAN CHANG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

vc

September 28, 1998